

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7-13 remain pending in this application. Claims 3 and 6 have been previously canceled.

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to limit the polyol recited to trimethylolpropane only. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 and 7-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. *Final Office Action* at 2.

Specifically, written description support for the embodiment where the polyol is a trihydric polyesterpolyol was questioned. Although applicants disagree with this rejection for the reasons of record, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, applicants have canceled reference to the trihydric polyesterpolyol embodiment without prejudice or disclaimer to place this application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Conclusions

For the reasons discussed in detail above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-13 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 21, 2011

By: Charles E. Van Horn
Charles E. Van Horn
Reg. No. 40,266
(202) 408-4000